<u>REMARKS</u>

In response to the Office Action mailed on October 30, 2008, Applicant(s) respectfully request(s) reconsideration.

Claims 1-36 now pending in this Application. In this Amendment, claims 1, 15, 21, 34 and 36 have been amended and claims 10, 18-20, 33 and 35 have been cancelled and claims 36-40 been added.

Claims 1, 15, 21, 34, 36 and 40 are independent claims and the remaining claims are dependent claims. Applicant(s) believe that the claim(s) as presented are in condition for allowance. A notice to this affect is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-13, 15-17, 21-23 25-27, 29-32 and 34-36 have been rejected under **35 U.S.C. §102(e)** as being anticipated by Kekic et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,664,978 (Kekic '978). Applicant(s) respectfully disagree(s) with these contentions and assert that the present claimed invention is not anticipated by any disclosure in the Kekic '978 references.

Applicant herein presents remarks and amendments to more specifically distinguish the featured of Applicant's inventions over the cited art of record. More specifically, the Office Action rejects claim 1 based on Kekic. With respect to claim 1, Kekic does not show, teach, or disclose a persistent association, nor that the persistent association is maintained via local and remote tables, as disclosed in the specification at page 16, lines 1-8.

The system of the present invention uses a local table and a remote table for managing the persistent associations between the publishers of a particular significant occurrence (i.e. an event) and the corresponding service entity, such as a handler for processing the event. The association persists throughout activation and deactivation of the service entity (handler for receiving the significant occurrence) responsive to the significant occurrence. Accordingly, claim 1 has been amended with the subject matter of claim 10, to recite <u>storing, in a global association table, an indication of the significant occurrence and an indication of the module containing the service entity, the global association table persistently independent of enablement of the module including the</u>

service entity corresponding to the significant occurrence, to more succinctly define and clarify these distinguishing features.

The Office Action suggests that Kekic anticipates the subject matter of claim 10 at col. 71, lines 33-38. The Kekic '978 approach, however, merely employs a hashtable. The hash table, indeed the alleged equivalent of the claimed associations, makes no distinction of persistent associations as claimed in claim 1, nor of the claimed indication of the module containing the service entity. As shown in Fig. 4, the global association table maintains both a specific entry for the significant occurrence 54-1 and the corresponding module 54-2. In contrast, Kekic '978 distinguishes only a type of update (Kekic, 71:37-38) corresponding to the listeners. Accordingly, the Kekic hash table cannot be said to anticipate the claimed persistent global association table because the hashed relations are neither persistent nor significant event driven, as now recited in amended claim 1.

New Claim 37, depending from claim 1, clarifies the global and local association tables by reciting that the persistent association is defined by a set of tables including the association, the set of tables for traversing the published significant occurrence from the detecting class entity to the service entity to be invoked as a result of the significant occurrence, at least one of the set of tables being a persistent table, the persistent table remaining active beyond the activation of the service entity, as discussed at page 15, lines 3-8 of the specification as filed.

Claim 38, depending from claim 1, further clarifies these distinguishing features by reciting that the global association map correlates the significant occurrences to the interoperable object reference (IOR) of the module containing the service entity, and the local association map correlates the significant occurrence to the handler responsive to the significant occurrence, as shown at page 16, lines 19-24.

Claim 39 further refines claim 38 by clarifying that the persistent association further comprises storing, in the local association table, the indication of the significant occurrence and an indication of the service entity corresponding to the significant occurrence, the local association table and the global association table collectively defining the persistent association, as disclosed at page 16, lines 19-29. These added

claims further clarify salient features of applicant's claimed invention in view of the cited prior art, and are therefore believed allowable for the reasons given above.

Independent claims 15, 21, 34 and 36, of similar scope as claim 1 and rejected on similar grounds, has been likewise amended and is therefore submitted as allowable.

With respect to claim 12, there is no identification of a handler <u>specific to</u> the particular significant occurrence, such as an event. Kekic merely invokes a screen method (col. 71, line 48). The cited portion of Kekic (71:46-48) recites that "When a notification is received, the notification dispatcher updates the affected TargetObject object and invokes method Screen.targetupdate (TargetObject target) on the current Screen." There is no selection of a specific method because the Screen method is always invoked.

Kekic continues to clarify that the "target object method getUpdateStatus() can be used to find the type of change. Possible values are class TargetObject constants CHANGE_CREATE, CHANGE_DELETE and CHANGE_MODIFY." Thus, the only control refinement that can be performed based on a notification is based on a type indication. Nowhere is shown, taught, or disclosed a specific dispatch service entity based on each particular significant occurrence as specified in the local association map 40, discussed at page 21, lines 8-15.

Claim 12 has been herein rewritten in independent form as added claim 40, and further including features of claim 7 and 8, to recite <u>a dispatch command specific to the handler responsive to the significant occurrence</u>, in further distinction of Applicant's claimed invention.

In contrast, the Kekic '978 notifications are grouped based on the type of change-CHANGE_CREATE, CHANGE_DELETE and CHANGE_MODIFY, as discussed at col. 71, lines 53-54. There is no showing, teaching or disclosure of an association from a specific significant occurrence to a dispatch routing for handling the specific occurrence, or event. Further, there is no showing, teaching or disclosure of a local association table for associating the service entity, nor of the global association table maintaining the association in a persistent manner.

Claims 18-20, 33 and 35 have been herein cancelled in the interest of advancing prosecution. As the remaining claims depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 15 and 21, it is respectfully submitted that all claims are now in condition for allowance.

Applicant(s) hereby petition(s) for any extension of time which is required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3735.

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 616-9660, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,

/CJL/

Christopher J. Lutz, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No.: 44,883
Chapin Intellectual Property Law, LLC
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive, Suite 280
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 616-9660
Facsimile: (508) 616-9661

Attorney Docket No.: EMC03-35(03166)

Dated: January 30, 2009